

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application

Inventors: Adcock et al.

Appln. No.: 10/334,473

Confirm. No.: 8726

Filed: December 31, 2002

Title: CALENDAR-BASED INTERFACES FOR
BROWSING AND MANIPULATION OF
DIGITAL IMAGES

PATENT APPLICATION

Art Unit: 2174

Examiner: Le V. Nguyen

Atty. Docket No.: FXPL-01054US0

Customer No. 23910

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW HELD 10/19/06

Commissioner for Patents

PO Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

The summary of an interview held on October 19, 2006 in response to the Office
Action dated June 28, 2006 is provided.

The Examiner is thanked for extending the courtesy of an interview on Thursday 19th October, 2006 at 2PM PCT. During the interview the Applicant indicated that the Applicant's invention called for a completely deterministic state machine [0016] line 10, whereas Marshall (U.S. Patent App. No. 2003/0070139) hereafter *Marshall*, requires a heuristic assessment, see paragraph [0039] line 6. The Applicant produced definitions of a deterministic state machine as a finite state machine where for each pair of state and input symbols there is one and only one transition to a next state, which the Applicant contrasted with a finite state machine in which behavior is composed of states, transitions and actions (wikipedia.org). The Applicant respectfully submitted that *Marshall* disclosed a finite state machine but not a deterministic state machine. The Examiner did not agree with the Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 26, 2006

By: /Anthony G. Craig/
Anthony G. Craig
Reg. No. 50,342

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928
Customer No. 23910
ACraig@fdml.com